

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AMARILLO DIVISION

AARON THOMAS,

Petitioner,

v.

LORIE DAVIS, Director,
Texas Department of Criminal Justice,
Correctional Institutions Division,

Respondent.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

2:18-CV-11

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
TO DISMISS PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

On January 17, 2018, petitioner, a state prisoner at the Neal Unit, submitted a “Petition for Review” wherein he appears to be attempting to initiate a proceeding for a federal writ of habeas corpus challenging a disciplinary proceeding conducted at the Neal Unit. On January 17, 2018, the Court ordered petitioner to submit to the Court, within twenty (20) days from the filing date of the Order, a properly completed form Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 which was transmitted with the Order. Petitioner was warned that failure to timely submit the form petition could result in the dismissal of this case without further notice.

As of this date, petitioner has not complied with the January 17, 2018 Order and is in direct disregard of an Order of the Court. Petitioner has not submitted any pleadings to this Court, nor has he communicated with this Court in any manner, since the January 17, 2018 Order. It is the opinion of the undersigned that petitioner has neglected his case to such an extent that it warrants dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the RECOMMENDATION of the United States Magistrate Judge to the United States District Judge that this case filed by petitioner AARON THOMAS be DISMISSED for want of prosecution.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE

The United States District Clerk is directed to send a copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation to each party by the most efficient means available.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

ENTERED February 9, 2018.


LEE ANN RENO
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

*** NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT ***

Any party may object to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. In the event parties wish to object, they are hereby NOTIFIED that the deadline for filing objections is fourteen (14) days from the date of filing as indicated by the “entered” date directly above the signature line. Service is complete upon mailing, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), or transmission by electronic means, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(E). **Any objections must be filed on or before the fourteenth (14th) day after this recommendation is filed** as indicated by the “entered” date. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d).

Any such objections shall be made in a written pleading entitled “Objections to the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation.” Objecting parties shall file the written objections with the United States District Clerk and serve a copy of such objections on all other parties. A party’s failure to timely file written objections shall bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings, legal conclusions, and recommendation set forth by the Magistrate Judge and accepted by the district court. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), *as recognized in ACS Recovery Servs., Inc. v. Griffin*, 676 F.3d 512, 521 n.5 (5th Cir. 2012); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276-77 (5th Cir. 1988).